IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH,

AT HYDERABAD

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S. RAO

W.P. No. 17955 OF 2005

Date: 29.09.2005

BETWEEN:

Smt. T. Surekha

.... PETITIONER

And

1. The Principal Secretary, Revenue Department, Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad, and others.

.... RESPONDENTS

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S. RAO

WRIT PETITION NO. 17955 OF 2005

ORDER:

The petitioner is daughter of one Butchanna, who owned land admeasuring an extent of Acs.17.30 in S.No.243 of Adilabad Village. It appears, the land was acquired for construction of 132/133-II K.V. Electricity Sub Station by A.P. Transco. The Petitioner alleges that only an extent of Acs.15.00 was acquired and remaining extent of Acs.2.30 continued to be shown to be in the name of the petitioner's father, which was inherited after demise of her father. The petitioner approached the fourth respondent for grant of pattadar passbook. By the impugned Memo dated 26.7.2005, the request was turned down by the Mandal Revenue Officer stating that the entire extent of land admeasuring Acs.17.30 in Adilabad village was acquired and therefore the land cannot be demarcated nor pattadar

passbook can be issued. The same is assailed in this writ petition.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue (General) for respondents 1 to 4 and learned Standing Counsel for A.P. Transco.

A copy of the judgment in O.P.No.10 of 1985 dated 27.2.1987 on the file of the Court of the Additional District Judge, Adilabad is placed before this Court, which would show that the entire extent of Acs.17.31 in S.No.240 was acquired and when there was a dispute between the petitioner and Mr. Kandula Pedda Ramulu, Kandula Chinna Ramulu and Smt. Gunnu Bai, the same was referred to Civil Court under Sections 30 and 31 (2) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894. The Civil Court adjudicated the matter and *inter alia* held that the petitioner herein is entitled to Acs.8.00. It is also submitted by the learned Standing Counsel that the petitioner already received the compensation.

In view of the above, the writ petition is misconceived and the petitioner has no enforceable right in this writ petition. The Writ Petition is accordingly dismissed at the admission stage.

_____

(**V.V.S. RAO, J.)**

29th September, 2005

Js